



Doc Code: AP.PRE.REQ

PTO/SB/33 (07-05)

Approved for use through xx/xx/200x. OMB 0651-00xx

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

**PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW**

Docket Number (Optional)

Q207-US1

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR 1.8(a)] on \_\_\_\_\_

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Typed or printed  
name \_\_\_\_\_Application Number  
10/820,955Filed  
April 7, 2004First Named Inventor  
BERG, Paul et al.Art Unit  
1795Examiner  
WILLS, Monique

Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified patent application. No amendments are being filed with this request.

This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.

The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s).

Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.

I am the

☐ applicant/inventor.☐ assignee of record of the entire interest.  
See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed.  
(Form PTO/SB/96)☒ attorney or agent of record.  
Registration number 42,491☐ attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34.  
Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34. \_\_\_\_\_

Signature

Travis Dodd

Typed or printed name

818-833-2003

Telephone number

03/12/2009

Date

NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required.

Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below\*.

☒ \*Total of \_\_\_\_\_ forms are submitted.

This collection of information is required by 37 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re application of:

Paul Berg

Serial No: 10/820,955

Filed: April 7, 2004

For: BATTERY CONNECTION STRUCTURE  
AND METHOD



Art Unit: 1795

Examiner: WILLS, Monique

Mail Stop AF  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review**

This communication is in response to the Office Action mailed on December 10, 2008 (the pending Office Action). Claims 1, 11, 17 and 22 are the only independent claims that remain pending.

**REMARKS**

**Claim 1**

Independent Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004-0161662 (Kim).

Claim 1 recites that "a fastening device having a shaft passing through the gasket and the hole in the insulator member." Claim 1 further recites "the fastening device applying a pressure in an axial direction of the hole in the cover to press the ... **first electrode tab ... and the second electrode tab against each other.**"

Kim teaches an electrode terminal 330 extending through a gasket 320 and a hole in an insulating plate 250. However, nothing in Kim teaches or suggests that the electrode terminal applies pressure that presses a first electrode tab and the second electrode tab against each other. As a result, Kim does not teach or suggest every element of claim 1 and claim 1 is patentable over Kim.

The Applicant made this argument in the Response filed on February 4, 2008. In response, the subsequent Office Action mailed on May 15, 2008, stated that these arguments

were persuasive. As a result, the May 15, 2008 Office Action agrees that the cited art fails to teach or suggest each of the elements identified in the Applicant's prior amendment.

A proper obviousness rejection requires that the cited art teaches or suggests every element of the claims. This requirement has been set forth in case law with statements such as "obviousness requires a suggestion of all limitations in a claim." *CFMT, Inc. v. Yieldup Intern. Corp.*, 349 F.3d 1333, 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2003) (citing *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 985 (CCPA 1974)). Although the recent Supreme Court case of *KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 127 S. Ct. 1727, 1739 (2007) has provided new standards for obviousness rejections, there is nothing in the *KSR* opinion that directly or indirectly overturned the requirement that the cited art teach or suggest every element of a claim properly rejected as obvious. Further, the Board of Patent Appeals and interferences continues to cite and apply this standard in decisions such as *Ex Parte H. Garrett Wada, and Matthew B. Murphy* (Appeal 2007-1925, decided on June 25, 2007). As a result, current law holds that an obviousness rejection is not properly supported unless the cited art teaches or suggests every element of the claims.

As noted above the Office Action mailed on May 15, 2008 concedes that Kim does not teach or suggest that the electrode terminal applies pressure that presses a first electrode tab and the second electrode tab against each other. As a result, Kim does not teach or suggest every element of the claims and the claim 1 and claim 1 is patentable over Kim.

### **Claim 11**

Independent Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004-0161662 (Kim).

Claim 11 recites "a case cover defining a hole" and "a fastening device having a shaft passing through the hole." Claim 11 also recites "the fastening device applying a pressure in an axial direction of the hole to press ... electrode tabs against each other."

Kim teaches an electrode terminal 330 extending through a gasket 320 and a hole in an insulating plate 250. However, nothing in Kim teaches or suggests that the electrode terminal applies a pressure that presses electrode tabs against each other. As a result, Kim does not teach or suggest every element of claim 11 and claim 11 is patentable over Kim.

The Applicant made this argument in the Response filed on February 4, 2008. In response, the subsequent Office Action mailed on May 15, 2008, stated that these arguments were persuasive. As a result, the May 15, 2008 Office Action agrees that the cited art fails to teach or suggest “the fastening device applying a pressure in an axial direction of the hole to press ... electrode tabs against each other.” As a result, Kim does not teach or suggest every element claim 11 and claim 11 is patentable over Kim.

### **Claims 17 and 22**

Independent Claims 17 and 22 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,579,640 (Nagase).

Independent Claims 17 and 22 each recite “one rivet mechanically coupling a first polarity electrode to a second polarity electrode.” Nagase teaches multiple positive electrodes coupled to a rivet. However, Nagase does not teach or suggest that the rivet couples electrodes of different polarities. For this reason alone, Nagase does not teach or suggest every element of claim 17 and 22. As a result, independent claims 17 and 22 are patentable over Nagase.

The Applicant made this argument in the Response filed on February 4, 2008. In response, the subsequent Office Action mailed on May 15, 2008, stated that the Applicant’s arguments were persuasive. As a result, the May 15, 2008 Office Action agrees that the cited art fails to teach or suggest “one rivet mechanically coupling a first polarity electrode to a second polarity electrode.” As a result, Nagase does not teach or suggest every element of claims 17 and 22. For this reason alone, independent claims 17 and 22 are patentable over Nagase.

Further, using a rivet to connect the different polarity electrode tabs disclosed in Figure 2 of Nagase (801a and 803a) would short circuit the battery. As a result, it would not be obvious for the Nagase electrodes to have opposite polarities. For this reason alone, independent claims 17 and 22 are patentable over Nagase.

**Conclusion**

The Applicant respectfully submits that legal error has been made in each of the above rejections. For these reasons, allowance of the currently pending claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted



TRAVIS DODD

Reg. No. 42,491

Agent for Applicant(s)

Quallion LLC  
P.O. Box 923127  
Sylmar, CA 91392-3127  
818-833-2003 ph  
818-833-2065 fax